

Appln. No.: 10/570,833  
Petition Dated August 17, 2010  
Response to Decision on Petition dated July 13, 2010

SIRF-113US

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Appln. No.: 10/570,833  
Applicant: Paul Underbrink et al.  
Filed: June 23, 2005  
Title: SIGNAL PROCESSING SYSTEM FOR SATELLITE POSITIONING SIGNALS  
T.C./A.U.:  
Examiner:  
Confirmation No.: 4057  
Docket No.: SIRF-113US

**RENEWED PETITION UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.137(b)**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Responsive to the Decision dated November 13, 2009, denying the Petition to Revive under 37 C.F.R. 1.137(b) Applicant submits the following as a Renewed Petition Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(b):

- 1) Declarations of: Paul A. Underbrink, Henry Falk, Steven A. Gronemeyer, Chittharanjan Dassannacharya, Charles P. Norman, Nicholas Vantalón, and Vojislav Protic; and
- 2) A Petition to Revive on the grounds of unintentional Abandonment, including the statement that "the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to this paragraph was unintentional."
- 3) A Petition under 37 C.F.R. § 1.182 explaining the difference in the name of inventor Vojislav Protic between the PCT application and the subject U.S. National Phase Application.

The surcharge fee was previously paid and Applicants request that it be applied to this response to the Notice of Missing Requirements.

A petition under 37 C.F.R. § 1.497(d) was granted in the communication dated 13 July 2010. A renewed petition under 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(b) was denied because the name of the inventor in the Declaration submitted with the petition under 37 C.F.R. § 1.137(b) is Vojislav Protic while the name of the same inventor on the International Application was Voya Protic. Pursuant to MPEP 1893.01(e) and 37 C.F.R. § 1.497(e), the PCT examiner required a petition under 37 C.F.R. § 1.182 to explain the difference in the inventor's name.

Appln. No.: 10/570,833  
Petition Dated August 17, 2010  
Response to Decision on Petition dated July 13, 2010

SIRF-113US

The petition fee set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(m) has been previously paid. Payment was acknowledged in the Decision on Petition dated June 3, 2009. Applicant requests that this fee be applied to the Renewed Petition.

It was also acknowledged in the Decision on Petition dated June 3, 2009, that no terminal disclaimer is required as the international application, of which the subject application is a National Phase application, was filed after June 8, 1995.

#### PETITION

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.137(b) Applicant requests that the response to the subject application be revived.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Kenneth N. Nigon, Reg. No. 31,549  
Attorney for Applicants

KNN/ems

Dated: August 17, 2010

☒ P.O. Box 980  
Valley Forge, PA 19482  
(610) 407-0700

The Director is hereby authorized to charge or credit Deposit Account No. 18-0350 for any additional fees, or any underpayment or credit for overpayment in connection herewith.

A\_H:\WRPORTBL\RP\KNIGON074\1014322\_1.DOC